

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow. Claims 1-7, 9 and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, one or more of which may be pursued in a divisional application. New claims 19-25 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 19-25 are pending for reconsideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,507 to Uda et al. (hereafter "Uda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,361,141 to Aoyama (hereafter "Aoyama"). These rejections are moot with respect to claims 1-7, 9 and 18, which have been cancelled. Insofar as these rejections pertain to new claims 19-25, Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

One object of the present invention is to provide an image processing apparatus that enables a serviceperson, who may repair or adjust the apparatus, to determine the cause of any image quality degradation without relying on his or her level of experience. To accomplish this objective, the present invention as recited in independent claim 19 includes structure for forming both image data based on reading a document (first image data) and image data indicative of operating conditions of the apparatus (second image data) on the same image formation medium, where the image data is synthesized together (See Figure 8B of the drawings, for example). Beneficially, the operating condition information, which determines image quality, is formed on the image formation medium, and aids a serviceperson in performing image adjustment work on the system, since information on the apparatus operating conditions can be printed (or otherwise formed on the image formation medium) along with an image based on other image data. The serviceperson can readily find in one place the image and the operating conditions, so adjustment can be made quickly and effectively.

Claim 19 includes specific structure to accomplish the above objective. Claim 19 includes a synthesizing means for synthesizing first image data (based on the image

data from a document) with second image data produced by an operating condition image producing means. The structure of claim 19 also includes a means for controlling an image formation means of the apparatus to form an image corresponding to the first and second image data synthesized by the synthesizing means on the image formation medium. Thus, the apparatus of claim 19 includes structure such that image data based on a read document is synthesized with operating condition image data, and the synthesized data is formed on an image formation medium. Uda and Aoyama fail to suggest this feature or its attendant advantages in aiding a serviceperson in servicing the apparatus.

Uda is directed to a scanner printer server that selectively controls a scanner and a printer. The scanner printer server 102 can transmit a print command to a printer 104 (col. 4, lines 61-63). Status information, such as paper out or paper jam, is transmitted from the printer 104 (col. 4, lines 63-65). Neither the status information nor the print commands, however, is printed on an image formation medium, and thus Uda fails to suggest forming both first image data and second image data on an image formation medium, where the second image data is indicative of operating conditions.

Furthermore, Uda does not disclose synthesizing first image data with second image data, for formation on an image formation medium. Admitting the failure of Uda to disclose such a synthesizing means, the Office Action points to Aoyama as allegedly disclosing a "synthesizing means for synthesizing the first image data with the second image data." Aoyama, however, does not suggest synthesizing first image data with second image data and then forming the synthesized data on an image formation medium.

Aoyama discloses a displaying section 7 that displays various developed display data together on a single screen so as to overlap, where the developed display data includes images of a document and edit data (Figure 1(a), col. 4, lines 39-51). Aoyama, however, discloses that the overlapped data is displayed on a screen, not an image formation medium as in claim 19. Also, Aoyama does not disclose the edit data to be data indicative of operating conditions. Thus, even if Uda and Aoyama could be properly combined (which they cannot), the combination would not suggest either (1)

synthesizing first image data with second image data and forming the synthesized data on an image formation medium, or (2) synthesizing first image data and second image data together, where the second image data is indicative of operating conditions, and thus the combination would not meet the limitations of claim 19.

The present invention of claim 19 provides important information to a serviceperson in a format which aids the serviceperson in image adjustment work, an advantage not recognized or suggested by the devices of Uda or Aoyama. In the present invention of claim 19, operating condition information, which determines image quality, is additionally formed on the image formation medium with other image data. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in either Uda or Aoyama. The present invention aids the serviceperson who repairs the image forming apparatus by providing both the first image data as well as the second image data (with information indicative of operating conditions) on the same image formation medium. As an example, in some embodiments of the invention, a serviceperson can check the operating conditions printed on a sheet of paper, as well as an image copy obtained by a scanner. In this manner, the serviceperson can easily determine which portion of the image forming apparatus is out of order.

For at least the reasons given above, applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over Uda and Aoyama. Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and are patentable over Uda and Aoyama for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 11, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438